REMARKS

Claims 68, 70, 72, 74, 77, and 80 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 68-82 remain pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 68-82 under 35 U.S.C. §112(1) and §102(e) based on Farber.

The amendments to the claims are believed to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112(1).

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 68, the claim has been amended to recite that the display device and content display system are in the same physical location and that each content provider system and that each content provider provides its content data "independently of each other content provider and without the content data being aggregated at a common physical location remote from the content display system prior to being provided to the content display system." Farber teaches aggregating content from multiple content providers 150-154 at a single service node 120 located remote from the display devices 101 and connected to the display devices 101 via a network connection. Farber col. 2, line 56 – col. 3, line 10 & Figure 1. The Office Action suggests (pp. 5-6) that Farber teaches sending data directly from the content providers 150-154 to the user computer 101, citing Farber col. 4 lines 8-11 and 29-31, but the cited portions of Farber merely describe alternative ways to aggregate the content provided by providers 150-154 at the service node 120, which as noted is remote from the display devices associated with personal computers 101. In fact, Farber states clearly that such aggregation is "essential" to the teaching of the Farber "insulates

Application Serial No. 09/528,803 Attorney Docket No. INT1P869C2 information providers from direct connection to user"). In summary, claim 68 recites sending content from providers to the content display system without first aggregating the content of multiple providers at a common node, while Farber teaches that such aggregation is essential. Therefore, claim 68 is believed to be allowable over Farber.

Claim 69 depends from claim 68 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Similarly to claim 68, claim 70 recites that "each associated content provider is located in a different physical location than at least one other content provider and each content provider provides its content data to the content display system independently of each other content provider and without the content data being aggregated at a common physical location remote from the content display system prior to being provided to the content display system." As such, claim 70 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 71 depends from claim 70 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Similarly to claim 68, claim 72 recites that "each associated content provider is located in a different physical location than at least one other content provider and each content provider provides its content data to a content display system associated with the and located entirely in the same physical location as the display device independently of each other content provider and without the content data being aggregated at a common physical location remote from the content display system prior to being provided to the content display system." As such, claim 72 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Application Serial No. 09/528,803 Attorney Docket No. INT1P869C2 Claim 73 depends from claim 72 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Similarly to claim 68, claim 74 recites that "each associated content provider is located in a different physical location than at least one other content provider and each content provider provides its content data to the content display system independently of each other content provider and without the content data being aggregated at a common physical location remote from the content display system prior to being provided to the content display system." As such, claim 74 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 75 and 76 depend from claim 74 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Similarly to claim 68, claim 77 recites that "each associated content provider is located in a different physical location than at least one other content provider and each content provider provides its content data to a content display system associated with the and located entirely in the same physical location as the display device independently of each other content provider and without the content data being aggregated at a common physical location remote from the content display system prior to being provided to the content display system." As such, claim 77 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 78 and 79 depend from claim 77 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Similarly to claim 68, claim 80 recites that "each associated content provider is located in a different physical location than at least one other content provider and each content provider provides its content data to a content display system associated with the and located entirely in

Application Serial No. 09/528,803 Attorney Docket No. INT1P869C2 the same physical location as the display device independently of each other content provider and without the content data being aggregated at a common physical location remote from the content display system prior to being provided to the content display system." As such, claim 80

Claims 81 and 82 depend from claim 80 and are believed to be allowable for the same

is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

reasons described above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Vellen D. Jomes

William J. James

Registration No. 40,661

V 408-973-2592

F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT AND YI, LLP 10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200 Cupertino, CA 95014